

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of ANIYA DANTRICE GILES,  
SADANTA GILES, and KADREMA S. GILES,  
Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MICHELENE DELORES GILES,  
  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

DANNY WILSON and JOHN DOE,  
  
Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED  
September 18, 2003

No. 244612  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 97-349892

---

Before: Smolenski, P.J., and Murphy and Wilder, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (i). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E)(1)(b).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that §19b(3)(g) was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I), now MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Although respondent-appellant successfully completed inpatient drug treatment, she did not fully comply with aftercare support in the form of counseling and AA/NA meetings and relapsed into cocaine use. In addition to her positive drug screens, the evidence showed that, during the eighteen-month history of this case, respondent-appellant never obtained steady employment or stable housing and thus was unable to provide the children with proper care or custody. Since respondent-appellant had also received services in a 1997 protective services proceeding to no avail and failed to comply with the components of her current parent agency agreement, the trial court was correct in concluding that there was no reasonable expectation that respondent-appellant would be able to provide proper care or custody for the

children within a reasonable time. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 346 n 3; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). There is no record support with respect to §19b(3)(i); however, it is unnecessary to address this ground because only one statutory ground is required to support termination. MCL 712A.19b(3).

Additionally, since no evidence was presented showing that termination was against the children's best interests, the trial court did not err in finding that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was not contrary to the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, supra* at 356-357. Thus, the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael R. Smolenski  
/s/ William B. Murphy  
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder